

The Real Pleasure

An essay by Adelaide Knowles

The real test here is easy to pass. This is a simple test to see if you are a victim. We may fight for human rights, but all of these things are still fallacies, we are asking for a phallic society to communicate in natural terms. This is an oxymoron. We presume that nature can shift to accommodate human nature, but by definition, it is what separates and elevates us above the laws of nature. Let me dictate that this is not about human supremacy – and in order for that to be understood I will refer to the self-indulgent isolated humanity as a *taker* and the world of nature with its laws and inhabitants *leavers* as per Daniel Quinn's 1992 novel Ishmael. My assertion here is feminism puts forward the case for *leavers* and the patriarchy asserts the philosophy of the *takers*. A taker is someone who doesn't give back, if ever there was a selfish species, it would be mankind. Our society dictates to us an environment, which we understand as being our own, of our own creation rather than the natural environments and habitats of the other inhabitants on our planet.

The environment in which we live, the human environment does not exist in a state of balance. In nature we see balance in some places, imbalance in others. I would cite sexual dimorphism as a characteristic trait in nature that allows the macroscopic to harmonize with the microcosmic, while we assume that there is a natural sexual instruction, there is no ambiguity or free will regarding the structures of various animal communities, lions, spiders, polar bears, hyenas, parrots etc, based on a gender evolution for survival. The human sexes would propose to be different, because of the human condition and our perception of free will. We assume that we can perceive somewhat lucidly the choices available to us (this is not argument for free will vs no free will). And so the only reason we question the power and structures of a patriarchy in our lives is because we do have that perception relating to free will, which can dictate to its own relative environment, the need for change.

I would interject that karma means we cannot escape from our choices and experiences, but we make and have them all the same. We have inherited the world, and not made it as our youthful illusions would suppose. That means we have limits that we may not perceive of. In the quest for equality there is a dichotomy where women identify with the injustices of the past, to carry on the quest for vindication from an unfair system, where a woman is empowered by the knowledge of her past. The opposite is true for men, because they are not quite the victims, and yet maybe they are and we don't or can't talk about how they experience subjugation within a society which expects (expected) too much of them. So men are forgetting the past, and erasing it, while women are remembering it and insisting upon it being a part of the present. Somehow we are assuming that from these two opposite directions, there will be a social and sexual convergence and reckoning which will benefit the overall scheme of things. I think it is important to realize the cataclysmic path of converging from opposite sides of an argument with opposing momentum. And so anyone who says they are a feminist or a "patriarchist" is heading towards that cataclysmic shock. The only way that one of these opposing sides can prevail is to be totalitarian and unilateral, to take on the vices of the other. This is not feminism; this is just a reassertion of an ethical bourgeois, just as once upon a time the patriarchy did virtuous things for

women. You might not understand my perspective, but I feel you will have achieved nothing, it will be the same muted and repressed masquerade in civility.

And so the answer here is that feminism has become an antagonist, and therefore is absurd and disenfranchised by a defaulting binary superiority and bureaucratic interjection. In other words, this is going to go on forever, according to the rules of engagement, rules of war and ideals of power as described in something like Foucault. The question is are you really a part of this cataclysmic binary? Either by choice or circumstance has your politics defaulted to a simple slog – Us vs Them, or even worse, us against us and therefore promoting them vs them? Who are they? They are men and women, born into a binary system without the free will to determine sex and thus are victims of that binary which both the patriarchy and feminism promote by default. Sexism and gender equality forces us to take sides in an arbitrary battle in which we are assigned by our gender, for which we have no say, at birth, to see ourselves as victims. We are not victims of a patriarchy we are victims of a binary. Feminism and sexism utilize the advantages of that binary system to enact sets of rhetorical privileges which, arbitrarily define what we perceive as fair, just and real. This binary does not reconcile any kind of anarchy which may be present in any given person at any given moment. It is a system of class dictating structure, which is to prevent the onset of the human condition. We have it, but we don't want it.

Under the veil of distortion here is the idea that Feminism is really humanism. The cause for equality based on our perceptions of unfairness and our belief on free will makes us act for political fairness in a system which makes decisions about what is right and what is wrong. If ever we could realize that we have taken a bite from that forbidden fruit it would be now. We think we know the difference between right and wrong, but we are already subject to reality and its contemporary ontology – Anarchy must reign! Feminism starts with ourselves, when it comes down to the most basic level it is a woman as she stands next to a man, her rights, motivations, body and will as she encounters an opponent, who competes for those very same things and she for his mind, presence, action and cause (and vice versa ideally) it is about preventing the violence and misunderstandings that gender binaries imply – that one human is a man, the other is a woman. Fortunately we are men and women and our long learned wisdoms have encountered many brilliant versions of them, which remind us of our humanity. However these social successes have lead to idealism in those qualities, body and mind, which begin to reconstruct the system of oppression, which dictates rules against the individuality and independence of an individual, a couple, a family, a city, state, country, ethnic race etc, which leads to prejudice, discrimination and eventually assimilation.

We are witnessing a period of great assimilation right now, the Western world, here is the feared bourgeois exacting its rules and ideals through religion and culture to the relative subclasses who have arrived at our present day with a different and therefore inferior history. The differences we fear are the reasons we subconsciously assimilate, benignly executive and guilt free because we imagine we are powerless, because our individual, couple, family and community senses of anarchy have already been erased. We cease to be an individual and take on the burden or debts of these human institutions which we believe empower us. The American Empire for example shows just how unjust our binary perceptions can be. Good versus evil, reverting to a binary and its superfluosity and untouchableness

to keep a bewildered people under control. There are no winners in a war, only victims and survivors where here does the American Empire admit that being the world's most prominent military power, might mean that it can be perceived as a tyrant, rather than a freedom fighter. After all why does the dominant military power fight for freedom? Because 'there are countries out there that are poorer and worst off than them and God forbid they should ever bring us down.'

I imagine as human beings we are struggling to grasp ourselves as being somewhere between powerless and omnipotent and our rules seem to parody our struggle. Ubiquitous governments that dictate that we should all have the certain human rights, that we can have access to our most basic needs, food, water, shelter and clothing. I wonder sometimes why the Geneva convention or the human moral conscious doesn't include sex in that short list of needs, because surely it is. Sex is taboo, we don't talk about it scientifically as one of the basic needs for survival, we talk about it in terms of sex and discrimination. Food, water, shelter and clothing are indiscriminate human needs, but sex, while we do need it, is divided by biology and gendered experience and therefore not considered a human need, rather a rite. A rite is something we do because we feel we have to, there are ways to avoid our needs on some level. Eating juicy fruits and vegetables and being inactive may mean you won't have to drink, and similarly there are many ways to avoid sex and sexuality on the basis of aversion and avoidance, but like food, water, shelter and clothing it dominates the modern commercial human environment. It is a need we refuse to accept as real, in some ways we still feel inferior to our sex and gender roles, which is why we suppress (in the past) alternative sexualities and gender expressions, were afraid of them and how it may make us feel. That the drive is sex and not procreative, that our sexual needs are superior to our reproductive ones, that we have to contend with our choices as men and women in a sexual and reproductive environment, when sometimes we rely on feeling that there is no choice –we have to admit to ourselves that as human beings with the human condition, we are afraid, terrified really.

Terrified of what a world would be like if all of a sudden we could question our gender assignments, our sex, if it disenfranchises sexual liberation in a sense, because sexual liberation reinforces our assigned gender roles and expectations, the biological impetus that pushes the gender/sex binary to the top of our human priorities, rather than to its rightful place among other observations, as something we can talk about, understand and move on from. The gender binary is breaking down, so is the sexual binary – the human world is expressing more sexualities and gender roles than ever before, in non-violent explorations of humanism and experience, it is our fear that can bring out the madness. It is because we are the same on same level that our politics appeals to our humanity for fairness, but the system, which is based on a patriarchy continues to repress those ideas and ideals based on the many fallacies that addle and control the daily lives, expectations and roles defined by history and our karma as human men and women to those who protect it. Money and its illusions – and it's here that the sexual mythology reinforces the sexist distinctions and indiscriminate power of society in civilization – sex, money and power. Unfortunately this is predominantly a way of life, and society is constructed around them. They replace our essential human drive for clothing, shelter food and water because they act as agents, replacing the direct source of life and reason, with a conjecture of hierarchy and dictation of those needs.

Society is complex when looked at as whole, but why do we? In theory it is in place to assist us, from our homes, workplace and leisure lives. We are not meant to take responsibility for billions, millions or thousands of lives – we are only asked to take care of a very small amount, including our own. If we move beyond ourselves, we can include our family, partner and friends into that circle of responsibility and duty of care. We only think about war, economics and environmental issues because they affect everyone, and therefore us as an individual, we have no way to immunize ourselves against their effects and so we study them. Unfortunately these factors are also means of controlling the individual perception and therefore the population, in a real world, we are already victims, because we believe in the almighty power of the state, in a similar suckling posture to the animals in nature, we are deferring our own personal freedoms, for the cause of the good over the bad and evil, to prevent suffering, and yet every time we do, we are losing power ourselves as people. As people we have become fractured into race, gender, religion, region and we imagine that we can do it badly. A bad Christian, a bad negro, a bad feminist, etc are ways we imagine that we as individuals have a duty to each other to prevent losing the ground we have made as a (slightly) human race. We think we have made money and a number other absolute truths viable for the universal medium, all we've done is confused what reality means and how it works. We've created a brave new world of rituals and rites that parody evolution by representing our fears. These agents are representative mediums, not universal ones – this is progressive in a democracy but it is within these mediums that corruption and power are defined and set to oppress the universal medium, creating and reinforcing illusions such as – We need money, and not food, we need new shoes and not love, we need a man and not a woman. Examples of how we pursue what we think we need, rather than what we do. Why do we not protect what matters most? We do we ask a patriarchy for equal rights, why ask a lion for celery?

It's because we don't live in a patriarchy, the patriarchy is a sociopolitical ideology that oppresses our universal medium, which we understand as being the Earth in the name of defensible benevolence and privilege for those who participate in its ideals. It's powerful, because it is what we have worked towards for centuries, millennia a provisional and respectable universal provider – and society could be if it were not for the agents which distort reality. Money is an agent, power is an agent, sex is an agent (although one of the least deceptive) and they are a part of the system we are trying to liberate ourselves from, women, men and everyone else. The patriarchy is a sociopathic virus which enables the binary to reassert itself as the benevolent bourgeois, and thus the battle ground for opposing forces. The answer here is to fracture the binary, politically anyhow, the two party system, gender expectation, sexual roles all are a part of a repressive logical clause which defers to the other to insulate against change and blame. We need to have a little pride rather than a defensible shame about what we have achieved as human beings, rather than our shortcomings with our separated prejudices within a human ideosphere. So what we make mistakes, we have to realize that we're never going to be perfect, not as politicians, not if we're attempting to create a fair world for every human being on this planet. You will find that some equalities are fairer than others. So to speak, we are witnessing and necessarily, the death of morality.

We are rotted, fetid and livid at ourselves and our politics, we cannot defend it universally, we have to tuck tale and run to moral high ground. There are always two sides a coin. On the one hand you have

the ethical retreat, I cannot help the starving African children and so I do not claim my superiority as a privileged westerner, because I am intimidated by my own lack of power within my own society – their fight is my fight as a universal proletariat. The other hand is of course, the impartial one, which from a point of dissociation reckons that I have the money, I have the power, there is a reason for that. The struggle for gender equality brings into perspective these accounts within a moral ethnography. The ethical feminists are saying the system is unjust, supporting the cause with facts, testimony and actions towards achieving equality. The impartial patriarch would imply that the responsibility has been thrust upon them, their power equates to that responsibility and the gender distribution of power in society is not a boys club motif, but a reckoning of history and its selection. The ethical feminist must imply that times are changing, rather than attempt to reconcile history – for she must rely on her legacy as a woman and therefore an equal of any man in her contributions to society, whether they be domestic or professional. The impartial patriarch at this point attempts to conceive of his role as a powerful instigator of social trends, as he is being consulted about the status of his uneven progression through the universal medium, via the social agency we know as the patriarchy. The ethical feminist protests for change, interrupting it, distracting it and disempowering it, forcing the patriarch to reconcile the present and she is not impartial, because she is not protected by the morals or lack of them within the patriarchal agent, she must overcome the obstacle which is the privilege she has given to men, as men, rather than human beings, and she reasserts her humanism within the universal medium as evidence of injustice. The impartial patriarch is probably becoming a little bit apathetic, believing that the reality is consensual and blame is esoteric and yet so much of this whole debate is intangible and theoretical. He reasserts that he is a product of selection and unable to reconcile his lack of morals, because they have accompanied normality. He is conflicted though as to why his normality has been interrupted, how he has become the villain, for he cannot perceive of the other's suffering. It goes on like this, and defaults to a binary opposition. Hello? Did anyone stop to think about the gender variant, disabled, or other social questioners and protesters?

Morality which we can attribute to impartiality and ethics which we can attribute to subjectivity are the logical operators of this entire argument. So what does it mean when morality dies? It means we cannot find the high ground, and that is how feminism attributes itself ethically to the patriarchy, there are no excuses. Unfortunately for the human in us, we are offended by the dichotomy of methods reverting to a binary, which assumes that morality will return and so too will gender normality and binary sexism, as soon as the ethics of feminism is satisfied. This is when the patriarchy will reassert itself – because it is impartial and still not subject to reality. And ethically, is Delilah really our patroness, will we cut Samson's hair for our love of him?

There is a choice here. When once there was not one, we no longer belong to our genders but to ourselves and each other, we are contacted as individuals as to whether what we are doing is moral or ethical, or valid in any way, we want an ethical patriarchy, just as the patriarch wants to be a part of a moral Earth – learning from each other the co-existence and dependence in our lifetimes on each other. Each other is a reference to ourselves as humans enacting gender roles that are biologically assigned to us, and understand the human connection which envelopes the entire universe and puts us together on a planet in the universe as humans and not just men and women. The gender is a blessing to be

enjoyed, a privilege and a responsibility that we as humans enact and empower, so much so that we can imagine and provide for the emergence of asexuality, gender variance and evolution within the social structures as well as the biological ones, that sex and gender is changing within the human experience and it will benefit us as stewards of this Earth and not inhabitants as we reach out beyond the original sin of knowing the difference between what is right and what is wrong, as we look upon this binary universe, rather than sulk within it - with love and humanity.